The Semiotic System and Structure Of Language

Khavaskhon Shokirova

Doctor of Philology, Acting Professor, Namangan State Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan

Abstract: This study explores semiotics as the study of sign systems, analyzing the relationship between language, reality, and cognition. The research aims to examine how linguistic signs function within semiotic structures and how they contribute to meaning-making. A theoretical approach is used, incorporating linguistic and semiotic analysis from major scholars like Saussure and Peirce. The findings highlight the interdependence between language and semiotic systems, demonstrating that linguistic structures play a crucial role in shaping human perception and communication.

Keywords: Semiotics, System of Signs, Semiology, Language, Reality, Perception, Cognition, Linguistic Sign, Meaning, Reflection, Representation, Form Of Sign, Relationship, Object, Concept, Thought, Expression, Speech.

Introduction

The development of society, the historical stages of linguistics, and the progressive evolution of fields reflect the advancements of an independent nation with its unique voice and path. From this perspective, the issues that contemporary Uzbek linguistics must address should serve the interests of the people and the multifaceted development of an independent state. As a component of life, human beings are constantly in interaction due to their activities, desire for knowledge, creativity, analysis-synthesis abilities, and exploration of one another and the world. Hence, language serves as a communicative necessity for people worldwide, functioning as the primary tool for understanding and perceiving social, spiritual, and educational reality.

In human life, the content, purpose, and outcomes of communication are fundamental factors. Meaningful and purposeful communication ensures its effectiveness. Language, therefore, is the tool for perceiving and expressing reality. Cognitive activity begins with humans' direct sensation, perception, and cognition of reality. Sensory perception lays the foundation for the formation of a symbolic understanding of reality in the mind. Language is fundamental to all fields, as it is through language that we bring to life the products of thought, every idea, and innovation. The more reality astonishes humanity, the stronger the need to study and explore it grows. Humanity's self-study and

its connection to reality, as well as the boundless significance of these relationships, underscore their global importance.

Human beings are conscious creatures who have yet to fully comprehend all the possibilities within themselves. Concepts such as existence and humanity, life and individuals, society and personality remain incomplete, and they serve as the basis for every science. Semiotics, considered one of the oldest sciences, has been refined over centuries through human thought and perception, evolving through extensive research and analysis. For years, semiotics has been regarded as the "queen of sciences." Its constant exploration and the discovery of its unexplored facets rejuvenate the field and give rise to new studies, which is no coincidence.

Methodology

Semiotics (from the Greek *semeiotikos* – the science of signs), or semiology, first, is a field of science that studies the general properties of signs and sign systems used to store and transmit information. Second, it is a system studied from the perspective of semiotics related to a specific object or phenomenon (e.g., the semiotics of a literary work, a specific journal, a piece of art, or communication customs of a particular nation). Semiotics (or semiology) is thus the study of sign systems, examining their general properties and aspects. Semiotics investigates signs, phenomena within sign systems, their nature, essence, types, forms, and processes.

As mentioned, semiotics is a doctrine of the theory of signs. One of its specific branches is linguosemiotics, which emerges from the purposeful relationship between linguistics and semiotics. Consequently, language, as a secondary sign system, becomes the object of investigation in linguosemiotics. In other words, linguosemiotics studies the sign nature of language and the properties of linguistic units that transmit information.

It is well-known that language, through its units (words, phrases, sentences, etc.), serves as a system of signs expressing meaning, concepts, and thoughts. These are symbols or signs of meaning, concepts, and thoughts. Thus, Ferdinand de Saussure defines language as a system of signs expressing ideas and thoughts. The object of semiotic research is the system of signs actively used by society, which has served humanity since its inception. In other words, like society, the system of signs is ancient. Sign systems emerge alongside society and are reflected within it. They exist only through human activity, are set in motion by this activity, fulfill specific functions, and are the result of human actions. Indeed, human activity, lifestyle, concepts, expressions of thought, and meanings are all signs that encompass human life and determine its direction.

Saussure's (1916) structuralist perspective argues that language is a system of arbitrary signs organized by syntagmatic and paradigmatic relationships. Peirce's (1931) semiotic theory extends this by classifying signs into icons, indexes, and symbols. Language primarily consists of symbols, where meaning is established through convention rather than resemblance or causality (Chandler, 2007). Additionally, Barthes (1967) explored the idea of myth and secondary signification, demonstrating how language carries cultural and ideological meanings beyond its literal interpretation.

Ufimceva (1986) emphasizes the complexity of defining the meaning of linguistic signs, as linguistic signs simultaneously fulfill multiple functions. She points out the dual

relationship between the form of a sign and its representation: (1) the relationship between the representation and the form of the sign and (2) the relationship between the representation and the object (the factual reality). The first is meaning, and the second is expression. These three interconnected parts (sign-concept-object) are reflected in the formation of sign meaning. Ufimceva (1986) further suggests that meaning can be identified as a special relationship between the components of a sign situation. The relationship between the sign, the object being represented, and the expression of the object arises only through human connection. This idea brings the scholar closer to the truth. Therefore, it can be concluded that the representation of a sign is reflected in our consciousness.

Result and Discussion

Linguistic structure is traditionally divided into five levels:

1. **Phonology**: The study of sounds and their organization within a language (Chomsky & Halle, 1968). Phonology plays a crucial role in distinguishing meaning through phonemes, the smallest units of sound in a language.
2. **Morphology**: The formation of words from morphemes, the smallest units of meaning (Aronoff & Fudeman, 2011). Morphology helps in understanding how affixation, compounding, and inflection contribute to meaning-making.
3. **Syntax**: The rules governing sentence structure and word order (Radford, 2004). Syntax determines how words combine to form grammatical and meaningful expressions.
4. **Semantics**: The study of meaning in language (Lyons, 1977). Semantics involves lexical semantics, which focuses on word meaning, and compositional semantics, which explores how sentence meaning emerges from individual word meanings.
5. **Pragmatics**: The study of meaning in context (Levinson, 1983). Pragmatics examines implicature, speech acts, and deixis, emphasizing how meaning is shaped by social and situational factors.

Each level contributes to the semiotic process by structuring how signs interact and produce meaning in discourse. Structuralist linguists, such as Jakobson (1960), also emphasized the communicative functions of language, identifying factors like the referential, expressive, and conative functions that influence linguistic meaning.

Modern linguistic approaches integrate semiotic principles to analyze meaning construction. For instance, Halliday's (1978) Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) views language as a resource for meaning-making within social contexts. Cognitive linguistics further explores how conceptual metaphors and mental schemas influence linguistic expression (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). These approaches underscore the role of signs in shaping linguistic structure and communication.

Furthermore, semiotic theory has influenced discourse analysis and multimodal communication studies. Kress and van Leeuwen (2001) extended semiotic principles beyond verbal language to examine visual and multimodal texts, arguing that meaning is constructed not only through words but also through images, gestures, and other semiotic modes. This broader semiotic perspective has significant implications for understanding language in digital and media contexts.

Conclusion

Understanding language as a semiotic system provides insights into its structure and communicative functions. The study of phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics reveals the intricate ways in which linguistic signs convey meaning. Semiotic theories from Saussure and Peirce remain foundational in linguistic research, influencing modern approaches that integrate cognitive and functional perspectives. Further research should explore interdisciplinary connections between semiotics, cognitive science, and linguistic typology.

References

Aronoff, M., & Fudeman, K. (2011). *What is morphology?* John Wiley & Sons.

Aznaurova E. *Pragmatics of Artistic Word*. – T.: Fan, 1988. –119.

Barthes, R. (1967). *Elements of semiology.* Hill and Wang.

Chandler, D. (2007). *Semiotics: The basics.* Routledge.

Chomsky, N., & Halle, M. (1968). *The sound pattern of English.* Harper & Row.

Hakimov M. *Foundations of Uzbek Pragmalinguistics*. – T.: Akademnashr, 2013. – 200 pages.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning.* Edward Arnold.

Jakobson, R. (1960). *Closing statement: Linguistics and poetics.* Harvard University Press.

Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (2001). *Multimodal discourse: The modes and media of contemporary communication.* Edward Arnold.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by.* University of Chicago Press.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics.* Cambridge University Press.

Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics.* Cambridge University Press.

National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan, Letter "S." T.: National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan, 2018. – P. 293. www.ziyouz.com library.

Nurmonov A., Mahmudov N. *Semantic Syntax of the Uzbek Language*. – T.

Online sources: https://uz.eferrit/com.

Peirce, C. S. (1931). *Collected papers of Charles Sanders Peirce.* Harvard University Press.

Radford, A. (2004). *English syntax: An introduction.* Cambridge University Press.

Safarov Sh. *Pragmalinguistics*. – T.: Fan, 2008. – P.76.

Saussure F. de. *Course in General Linguistics (Extracts)* // Anthology of the History of Linguistics of the 19th–20th Centuries. – M., 1956. – P. 336.

Saussure, F. de. (1916). *Course in general linguistics.* Open Court Publishing.

Shokirova H.N. "Descriptive Pragmatic Construction," scientific article, *Neo Scientific Peer Reviewed Journal*, Amsterdam, Netherlands, ISSN (Online): 2949-7752, JIF: 7.685 Volume 14, October 2023.

Shokirova H.N. *Foundations of Literacy*. – Fergana. Classik, 2024, 189 pages.

Shokirova H.N. *Semantic Syntax*. – Fergana. Classik, 2024, 200 pages.

Shokirova Kh. *The Linguosemiotic Structure of Language (Based on Semantic-Sigmatic and Syntactic-Pragmatic Aspects)*. Doctoral Dissertation. – Fergana, 2022. – 240 pages.

Shokirova Kh. *The Predicate Category in Uzbek Language: Personal Actants and Their Speech Realizations*. PhD Dissertation. – Tashkent, 2009. – 127 pages.

Susov I.P. *Linguistic Pragmatics*. – M.: Vostok-Zapad, 2006. – P.33.

Ufimceva A.A. *Lexical Meaning*. – M.: Nauka, 1986.

Vakhtel N.M. *Fundamentals of Pragmalinguistics*. Voronezh, Voronezh State University Press, 2008. – P.15.